

## REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully submit this Amendment and Request for Reconsideration in response to the Office Action of 22 March 2007 for the present application.

In the present Amendment, the Applicants amend claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 15, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, and 31, no claims have been added or canceled. Therefore, the application has claims 1-37 as amended currently pending for reconsideration. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been entered by such amendment; the amendments are fully supported by the application as originally submitted.

*In the Office Action of 22 March 2007, the Examiner rejected claims of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eriksson et al. (US 2003/0026223 A1) in view of Schmidt (US 2003/0031148 A1) and other references. In response, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections and submit that the claims as amended are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the following reasons.*

The claims recite, among other things, that the communication takes place between a wireless local area network (WLAN) and a mobile station (e.g. devices operating in accordance IEEE 802.11). The cellular network broadcast information that is communicated within such network includes information for "identifying [a] plurality of cellular networks available for communication" with the mobile station. Such information is utilized by the mobile station in "performing a network selection

procedure" to select one of the plurality of cellular networks for communication.

Advantageously, to accommodate different communication technologies available, this information is formatted in a "generic container message" which varies in content and format in accordance with different cellular standards associated with the plurality of cellular networks. Further advantageously, such information is communicated in an authentication procedure which utilizes an extensible authentication protocol.

For a proper rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art alone or in combination must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. In addition, there must be an adequate suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of the prior art.

The prior art in combination fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. For one, Eriksson et al. fail to teach or suggest operations in a *wireless local area network or WLAN* through which cellular network broadcast information is communicated. Instead, Eriksson et al. teach a GSM network, which is considered a *wireless wide area network* by those ordinarily skilled in the art. It is indeed true that cellular networks are capable of broadcasting cellular network broadcast information, but communicating cellular network broadcast information via a WLAN to a mobile station is an entirely different thing. Thus, the basic environment of Eriksson et al. is not applicable to the techniques claimed herein.

The present techniques allow a mobile station which *operates in a WLAN* to perform a network selection procedure for selecting a preferred network from the plurality of cellular networks identified from the cellular network broadcast information, for example, based on a preferred list of

networks as well as its home network. Importantly, the generic container message that includes the cellular network broadcast information "varies in content and format in accordance with different cellular standards associated with the plurality of cellular networks." Thus, depending on the cellular networks that are available to the WLAN, the generic container message contains cellular network information from a variety of different types of networks, and is encoded and/or otherwise communicated in accordance with the appropriate cellular standard in each case. Thus, according to the present techniques, different cellular technologies are supported – as opposed to just a single cellular technology – for network selection for any given mobile station. Such information is advantageously communicated in an authentication procedure which utilizes an extensible authentication protocol (e.g. EAP for IEEE 802.11 communications).

Based on the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended define subject matter that is now both novel and inventive over the prior art.

Thank you. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if necessary to further expedite this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

/John J. Oskorep/

Date: 20 June 2007

JOHN J. OSKOREP  
Reg. No. 41,234

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ. LLC  
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER  
980 NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 USA  
Telephone: (312) 222-1860 Fax: (312) 475-1850